

**REMARKS**

**Status of Claims:**

Claims 1-55 were pending at the time of the Office action. Claims 1-16, 28-45, 51 and 52 were indicated as being withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-16, 28-45, 51 and 52 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, claims 17, 19, 21, 46, 48, 50, 53 and 55 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 18, 20, 22-24, 26, 27, 47, 49, and 54 are amended herein. Claims 56-58 are newly added. No new matter is added.

Thus, claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49, 54 and 56-58 are now pending in the application. A detailed listing of all claims that are in the application, is presented, with appropriately defined status identifiers.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112**

In paragraph 3 of the Office action, claims 17, 18, 21, 46, 47, 50 and 53-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

As previously noted, claims 17, 21, 46, 50, 53 and 55 are canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

With regards to claims 18, 47 and 54 -- in paragraph 3 of the Office action, the Examiner stated that "other node" was an indefinite term. Applicants have amended each of claims 18, 47 and 54 to remove references to "other node[.]" As such, it is believed that claims 18, 47 and 54 fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

With regards to claim 26 -- in paragraph 4 of the Office action, the Examiner stated that there was insufficient antecedent basis for the reference to "said external database

server[.]” Applicants have amended claim 26 to depend from claim 24, which provides proper basis for the noted subject matter. As such, it is believed that claim 26 fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101**

In paragraph 5 of the Office action, claims 46-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As previously noted, claims 46, 48 and 50 are canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

As suggested by the examiner, claim 47 has been amended to recite “A computer-readable storage medium . . .” Claim 49 has been amended to recite “The computer-readable storage medium as set forth in claim 47 . . .”

As such, it is believed that claims 47 and 49 fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

In paragraph 7 of the Office action, claims 17-26, 46-50 and 53-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Somasundaram et al. (“Somasundaram,” U.S. Patent No. 7,334,049).

As previously noted, claims 17, 19, 21, 46, 48, 50, 53 and 55 are canceled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

The rejection of claims 18, 20, 22-26, 47, 49 and 54 is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 18 recites a packet transfer device comprising:

a DNS proxy unit for receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to said client, **said name resolution response message including an IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more packet transfer information fields, and for**

**rewriting a routing table** of said DNS proxy unit **to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields**,

wherein said DNS proxy unit is configured to **control said transfer** of the packets between said client and said destination **according to said one or more packet transfer information fields**, and

**wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier.** (Emphasis Added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest all features of amended claim 18.

In paragraph 10 of the Office action, the Examiner stated that Somasundaram's disclosure that "a binding is created between the address given by the DNS payload and the selected pool address" (see Office action, page 4, paragraph 10) discloses certain features of claim 18.

To the extent that such features were disclosed or suggested in Somasundaram, Applicants are unable to find in Somasundaram disclosure or suggestion of features recited in claim 18, as amended herein. For example, Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest **"rewriting a routing table of said DNS proxy unit to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields."** Further, Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest (1) "said DNS proxy unit is configured to **control said transfer** of the packets between said client and said destination **according to said one or more packet transfer information fields**" and/or (2) "wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier."

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 18 is not anticipated by Somasundaram.

Claims 20 and 22-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 18. At least for this reason, it is believed that claims 20 and 22-26 are not anticipated by Somasundaram.

As amended, claim 47 recites a computer-readable storage medium storing computer-readable instructions, said computer-readable instructions configured to cause a computing device to:

perform a proxy function of receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to a client, **said name resolution response message including an IP address according to a destination and one or more packet transfer information fields**, and **rewriting a routing table to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields**; and

**control a transfer** of a plurality of packets between said client and said destination **according to said one or more packet transfer information fields**,

**wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier**. (Emphasis Added).

For reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 18, it is believed that claim 47 is not anticipated by Somasundaram.

Claim 49 depends directly from claim 47. At least for this reason, it is believed that claim 49 is not anticipated by Somasundaram.

As amended, claim 54 recites a packet transfer method of transferring a plurality of packets between a client and a destination, said method comprising:

receiving a name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to said client, **said name resolution response message including an IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more packet transfer information fields**;

**rewriting a routing table to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields**; and

**controlling said transfer** of said packets between said client and said destination **according to said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields**,

**wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier.** (Emphasis Added).

For reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 18, it is believed that claim 54 is not anticipated by Somasundaram.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

In paragraph 22 of the Office action, claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somasundaram and further in view of Inoue et al. (“Inoue,” U.S. Patent No. 7,103,663).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 27 depends indirectly from claim 18. As explained with respect to claim 18, Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest certain features of claim 18. Further, Applicants are unable to find in Inoue disclosure or suggestion of these features.

In more detail, Inoue does not disclose or suggest “**rewriting a routing table** of said DNS proxy unit **to include said IP address and said one or more packet transfer information fields.**” Further, Inoue does not disclose or suggest (1) “said DNS proxy unit is configured to **control said transfer** of the packets between said client and said destination **according to said one or more packet transfer information fields**” and/or (2) “wherein said one or more packet transfer information fields include at least one of a packet transfer priority field, a logical network identifier, and a logical channel identifier.”

As such, it is believed that claim 27 is patentable over Somasundaram and further in view of Inoue.

### **New Claims**

Newly added claims 56, 57 and 58 depend directly from claims 18, 47 and 54, respectively. At least for this reason, it is believed that claims 56, 57 and 58 are patentable

over the cited references. Further, it is believed that claims 56-58 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

**Concluding Remarks**

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 27, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Norante (Reg. No. 58,941)

*for* George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,072